



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,229	08/20/2003	Sigang Qiu	P16581	5721
28062	7590	04/22/2005	EXAMINER	
BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC			TRAN, QUOC DUC	
5 ELM STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			2643	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/644,229	QIU, SIGANG
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Quoc D Tran	2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2003.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

.9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2003 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 12-15, 20, 23, 26, 29, 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liang et al (6,445,773).

Consider claim 1, Liang et al teach a method comprising: performing at least part of a digital subscriber line handshaking process by transmitting at least one handshaking signal via a telephone subscriber loop (col. 4 line 62 – col. 5 line 16); and analyzing the at least one handshaking signal to detect a characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36).

Consider claim 2, Liang et al teach the method further comprising: determining an operating function (i.e., data rates) of an item of terminal equipment connected to the telephone subscriber loop based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 36).

Consider claim 12, Liang et al teach the method further comprising: determining, based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop, a parameter for a digital subscriber line training process (col. 5 lines 17-32).

Consider claim 13, Liang et al teach wherein the determined parameter is used for one of (a) an equalizer function, (b) a timing recovery function, and (c) an automatic gain control function (col. 5 lines 17-32).

Consider claim 14, Liang et al teach the method further comprising: predicting a digital subscriber line service data rate for the telephone subscriber loop on the basis of the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 8 lines 7-41).

Consider claim 15, Liang et al teach a method comprising: detecting a characteristic of a telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36); and determining an operating function (i.e., data rates) of an item of terminal equipment connected to the telephone subscriber loop based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 36).

Consider claim 20, Liang et al teach an apparatus comprising: a memory; a processor coupled to the memory to: receive at least one handshaking signal transmitted via a telephone subscriber loop in connection with a digital subscriber line handshaking process (col. 4 line 62 – col. 5 line 16); and analyze the at least one handshaking signal to detect a characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36). It should be noted that the test devices (i.e., DSL modems) are inherently contain memory and processor.

Consider claim 23, Liang et al teach an apparatus comprising: means for receiving at least one handshaking signal transmitted via a telephone subscriber loop in connection with a digital subscriber line handshaking process (col. 4 line 62 – col. 5 line 16); and means for analyzing the at least one handshaking signal to detect a characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36).

Consider claim 26, Liang et al teach an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that when executed by a machine result in the following (col. 8 lines 44-47): receiving at least one handshaking signal transmitted via a telephone subscriber loop in connection with a digital subscriber line handshaking process (col. 4 line 62 – col. 5 line 16); and analyzing the at least one handshaking signal to detect a characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36).

Consider claim 29, Liang et al teach an apparatus comprising: a memory; a processor coupled to the memory to: detect a characteristic of a telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36); and determine, based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop, an operating function of an item of terminal equipment connected to the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 36). It should be noted that the test devices (i.e., DSL modems) are inherently contain memory and processor.

Consider claim 33, Liang et al teach an apparatus comprising: means for detecting a characteristic of a telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36); and means for determining, based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop, an operating function of an item of terminal equipment connected to the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 36).

Consider claim 37, Liang et al teach an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that when executed by a machine result in the following (col. 8 lines 44-47): detecting a characteristic of a telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36); and determining, based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber

loop, an operating function of an item of terminal equipment connected to the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 36).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 16, 30, 34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Levin et al (6,625,777).

Consider claims 3, 16, 30, 34 and 38, Liang et al did not suggest wherein the determining includes determining whether to perform trellis coded modulation in the item of terminal equipment. However, Levin et al suggested such (col. 4 lines 3-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levin et al into view of Liang et al in order to determine the optimal performance of the line.

5. Claims 4-6, 17-19, 31-32, 35-36, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Levin et al (6,625,777) and further in view of Afzal (6,826,258).

Consider claims 4, 17, 31, 35 and 39 Liang and Levin et al did not suggest wherein the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop is an estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop. However, Afzal suggested such (col. 9 line 61 – col. 10 line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to incorporate the teaching of Afzal into view of Liang and Levin et al in order to provide optimum network performance.

Consider claims 5, 18, 32, 36 and 40, Levin et al teach wherein it is determined not to perform trellis coded modulation in the item of terminal equipment if the estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop is less than a predetermined length (col. 12 lines 46-67).

Consider claims 6, 19 Liang et al teach wherein the item of terminal equipment is a digital subscriber line modem (col. 4 lines 62-64).

6. Claims 7-8, 21, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Afzal (6,826,258).

Consider claims 7-8, 21, 24 and 27, Liang et al did not suggest wherein the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop is an estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop. However, Afzal suggested such (col. 9 line 61 – col. 10 line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Afzal into view of Liang et al in order to provide optimum network performance.

7. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Nelson et al (6,263,048).

Consider claim 9, Liang et al did not suggest wherein the analyzing includes comparing a power spectrum density of upstream signal carriers to a power spectrum density of downstream signal carriers (i.e., power ratio). However, Nelson et al suggested such (col. 2 lines 20-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nelson et al into view of Liang et al provide optimum network performance.

Consider claim 10, Nelson et al teach wherein the analyzing also includes comparing a power spectrum density of a first group of downstream signal carriers to a power spectrum density of a second group of downstream signal carriers, wherein each signal carrier of the first group of downstream signal carriers is at a higher frequency than each signal carrier of the second group of downstream signal carriers (col. 2 lines 20-46; col. 5 lines 25-29).

Consider claim 11, Liang et al did not suggest wherein the analyzing includes comparing a power spectrum density of a first group of downstream signal carriers to a power spectrum density of a second group of downstream signal carriers, wherein each signal carrier of the first group of downstream signal carriers is at a higher frequency than each signal carrier of the second group of downstream signal carriers. However, Nelson et al suggested such (col. 2 lines 20-46; col. 5 lines 25-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nelson et al into view of Liang et al provide optimum network performance.

8. Claims 22, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Afzal (6,826,258) and further in view of Levin et al (6,625,777).

Consider claims 22, 25 and 28, Liang and Afzal did not suggest wherein the processor is also to determine not to perform trellis coded modulation if the estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop is less than a predetermined length (col. 12 lines 46-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the teaching of Levin et al into view of Liang and Afzal in order to determine the optimal performance of the line.

9. Claims 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Johnson (6,845,248).

Consider claim 41, Liang et al teach a system comprising: the digital subscriber line modem including: a memory; a processor coupled to the memory to: receive at least one handshaking signal transmitted via a telephone subscriber loop in connection with a digital subscriber line handshaking process (col. 4 line 62 – col. 5 line 16); and analyze the at least one handshaking signal to detect a characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36). It should be noted that the test devices (i.e., DSL modems) are inherently contain memory and processor.

Liang et al did not suggest the system comprising a radio frequency transceiver; and a digital subscriber line modem coupled to the radio frequency transceiver, However, Johnson suggested such (see Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Johnson into view of Liang et al in order to provide communication with the modem wirelessly.

Consider claim 44, Liang et al teach a system comprising: the digital subscriber line modem including: a memory; a processor coupled to the memory to: detect a characteristic of a telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 53 – col. 8 line 36); and determine, based at least in part on the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop, an operating function of an item of terminal equipment connected to the telephone subscriber loop (col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 36). It

should be noted that the test devices (i.e., DSL modems) are inherently contain memory and processor.

Liang et al did not suggest the system comprising a radio frequency transceiver; and a digital subscriber line modem coupled to the radio frequency transceiver, However, Johnson suggested such (see Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Johnson into view of Liang et al in order to provide communication with the modem wirelessly.

10. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Johnson (6,845,248) and further in view of Afzal (6,826,258).

Consider claim 42, Liang et al did not suggest wherein the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop is an estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop. However, Afzal suggested such (col. 9 line 61 – col. 10 line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Afzal into view of Liang and Johnson order to provide optimum network performance.

11. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) and Johnson (6,845,248) in view of Afzal (6,826,258) and further in view of Levin et al (6,625,777).

Consider claim 43, Liang, Johnson and Afzal did not suggest wherein the processor is also to determine not to perform trellis coded modulation if the estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop is less than a predetermined length. However, Levin et al suggested such (col. 12 lines 46-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levin et al into view of Liang, Johnson and Afzal in order to determine the optimal performance of the line.

12. Claims 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) in view of Johnson (6,845,248) and further in view of Levin et al (6,625,777).

Consider claim 45, Liang and Johnson did not suggest wherein the determination of the operating function includes determining whether to perform trellis coded modulation. However, Levin et al suggested such (col. 4 lines 3-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levin et al into view of Liang and Johnson in order to determine the optimal performance of the line.

13. Claims 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al (6,445,773) and Johnson (6,845,248) in view of Levin (6,625,777) and further in view of Afzal (6,826,258).

Consider claim 46, Liang et al did not suggest wherein the detected characteristic of the telephone subscriber loop is an estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop. However, Afzal suggested such (col. 9 line 61 – col. 10 line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Afzal into view of Liang, Johnson and Levin et al in order to provide optimum network performance.

Consider claim 47, Levin et al teach wherein the processor is also to determine not to perform trellis coded modulation if the estimated length of the telephone subscriber loop is less than a predetermined length (col. 12 lines 46-67).

***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
15. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_ (explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Facsimile responses should be faxed to:  
**(703) 872-9306**  
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7511**. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, TH and SATURDAY from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7499**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2600**.

**QUOCTRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**



AU 2643  
April 12, 2005